

REMARKS

1. Introduction

Applicant respectfully thanks Examiner Chin for the courtesies extended in the personal interview of June 6, 2007. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication the claims 19-20 would be allowed if rewritten in independent claim form.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 12, 14, and 15 have been amended, and claim 26 has been newly added. No new matter is being presented. Claims 24 and 25 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. In view of the following remarks, allowance of all the pending claims is respectfully requested.

2. Personal Interview of June 6, 2007

In the personal interview of June 6, 2007, the Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the Examiner's position regarding the claims of the pending application. The Examiner made various suggestions about claim language that would distinguish over the references of record. Applicant sincerely thanks the Examiner for the suggestions made in the personal interview and in the Interview Summary form.

3. Rejections under 35 USC 103

In the Office Action of March 19, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 12-18, 22 and 23 under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,841,592 to Restivo in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,235,722 to Harris et al. Claims 11 and 21 were rejected under 103(a) based on Restivo, Harris et al., and further in view of either U.S. Patent No. 2,896,243 to Shoenfield or U.S. Patent No. 6,345,409 to LaCroix. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, among other things, "a dust gutter extending outwardly from said lower major surface at said first opening and at a downward incline with respect to said lower major surface so that said dust gutter lies below said lower major surface of said housing and dust on the fan blade falls away from said first opening into said dust gutter when the fan blade is moved in said first opening."

Applicant respectfully submits that Restivo and Harris et al., either alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest this feature.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on the dust receptacle 17 best shown in Figure 3 of Harris et al. as Applicant's "dust gutter." However, it is evident from Figure 3 in Harris et al. that the dust receptacle 17 extends upward toward the opening in the molded housing 3. Therefore, Harris et al.'s dust receptacle 17 cannot be interpreted as "a dust gutter extending ...downward incline with respect to said lower major surface so that said dust gutter lies below said lower major surface of said housing ...," as presently recited in independent claim 1 of Applicant's invention.

Furthermore, none of the other references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest "a dust gutter extending outwardly from said lower major surface at said first opening and at a downward incline with respect to said lower major surface so that said dust gutter lies below said lower major surface of said housing and dust on the fan blade falls away from said first opening into said dust gutter when the fan blade is moved in said first opening," as presently recited in independent claim 1 of Applicant's invention. For example, in LaCroix, the shaped guide member 7 extends perpendicular to the sides 3c and 3d of the head 3, as described in column 3, lines 7-10 and shown in Figures 1, 3, and 6 of LaCroix. Thus, LaCroix does not teach or suggest the "dust gutter," as presently claimed.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is patentable over the references made of record. Regarding claims 2-18 and 21-23 it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reason that claims 2-18 and 21-23 depend from allowable independent claim 1 and therefore contain each of the features as recited in this claim, claims 2-18 and 21-23 are therefore also patentable over the references previously relied on by the Examiner.

4. New Independent Claim 26

New independent claim 26 recites features, which are not taught in the references made of record, for example, "first and second cleaning pads disposed inside said passageway, said first and second cleaning pads having first and second planar cleaning surfaces, respectively, for contacting opposing sides of the fan blade when the fan blade

is moved through said passageway, and said first and second cleaning pads arranged with substantially no gap between said first and second planar cleaning surfaces so that the fan blade deforms the first and second cleaning pads when inserted therebetween.” Applicant respectfully submits that support for newly added claim 26 can be found in Figure 3 and page 4, lines 18-bottom of Applicant’s specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 26 does not present new matter, and is allowable over the references made of record.


5. Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account debit Account 50-0548.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Valencia', written over a horizontal line.

Daniel E. Valencia
Registration No. 56,463
Attorney for Applicant

Berenato, White & Stavish LLC
6550 Rock Spring Drive, Ste. 240
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
(301)896-0600